EXHIBIT A

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

BY FAX

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

SUM-100

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

NFI Interactive Logistics, LLC, a New Jersey Company; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

Gaspar Cuevas, an individual and all individual Plaintiffs on Behalf of themselves and all other similiarly

situated non exempt former and current employee

Conformed Copy original filed Superior Court of California County of Los Anaeles

MAR 2 2 2018

| Sherri R. Daylor, LACCOLLE UNICET/Clere | ţ |
|---|---|
| By: M. Sula Daputy | • |
| Moses Solo | ı |

NCTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfinelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you-if-you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinlo.ca.gov/selfnelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The count's lien must be paid before the count will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta cilación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la bulioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulano de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisi in a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener sexiciós legales gratuitos de un

programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio wel Ecalicania Legal Services, ewilawi el pealifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o ponitivo de Services de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o ponitivo (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o ponitivo (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o ponitivo (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o ponitivo (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poni cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

| the name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es): | | tral | District | - Stanley | Mosk |
|---|---|------|----------|-----------|------|
| 11-N. Hill St. | 1 | ι | • | • | |

CASE NUML TE (Número del Caso):

Los Angeles, CA 90012

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiffs attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(<u>El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):</u>

Grant J. Savoy, Esq.; 316 W. 2nd St., Ste. 1200, Los Angeles, CA 90012, Tel: (213) 814-4940

| DATE: March 22, 2018 (Fecha) MAR 2 | 2 2010 | ierri R. Carter | (Secretario) _ | · | M. Soto | , Deputy <i>(Adjunto)</i> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| (For proof of service of this sum (Para prueba de entrega de esta | mons, use Proo a citatión use el | of Service of Sum formulario Proof of | mons <i>(form PO</i> Service of Sum | S-010).) mons, (POS-01) | 0)). | |
| [SEAL] | 1 as an | HE PERSON SERV | nt. | | | |
| | 3. On be | half of (specify): CCP 416, 10 (co | OFI poration | Dew J | eractive ersey Amy CCP 416.60 (minor) | loguhes, |
| | |] CCP 416.20 (de] CCP 416.40 (ás | funct corporatio | n) | CCP 416.70 (conservated CCP 416.90 (authorized | ee) |
| | 4. by pe |] other <i>(specify):</i> rsonal delivery on <i>(</i> | idate): B | 3/18 | | Page 1 of 4 |

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of Califo SUM-100 [Rev. July 1, 2009]

SUMMONS

Code of Civil Procedure §§ 412.20, 465

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Case No.:

Case 2:18-cv-03320-JGB-SP Document 1-1 Filed 04/20/18

Page ID #:15

COMES NOW Plaintiff GASPAR CUEVAS, an individual over the age of 18, for causes of action against Defendants NFI INTERACTIVE LOGISTICS, LLC (hereinafter referred to as "NFI" or "Defendant") and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants"). Plaintiff alleges as follows:

<u>JURISDICTION AND VENUE</u>

1. At least some of the acts complained of herein occurred in Los Angeles County, as Defendants employed the named Plaintiff and numerous other members of the Plaintiff Class in the County of Los Angeles at some time relevant to the facts complained of herein. [Unisdiction and versue are proper in this Court because some or all of the claims alleged.]

Jurisdiction and venue are proper in this Court because some or all of the claims alleged herein arose in Los Angeles County and some or all of the Defendants were and/or are residents of Los Angeles County, and/or are doing or did business in Los Angeles County,

and/or their principal place of business is in Los Angeles, at times relevant herein.

2. The amount in controversy in this matter exceeds the sum of \$25,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs. However, each individual Plaintiff Class Member is owed less than \$75,000, and the aggregate amount owed for the class does not exceed \$5,000,000.

PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff GASPAR CUEVAS (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff" or "CUEVAS"), an individual, alleges knowledge as to his own, and information and belief as to all other matters, as follows: Plaintiff was, at all times mentioned herein, a resident of the County of Los Angeles, in the State of California. Plaintiff Cuevas was employed by Defendants NFI INTERACTIVE LOGISTICS, LLC from October 2015 until November 30, 2017.
- 4. Defendant NFI INTERACTIVE LOGISTICS, LLC (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant" or "NFI") is and was, at all times mentioned herein, a Limited Liability Company in the state of New Jersey, and is authorized and doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California at various locations. At all material times alleged herein, Defendant NFI was subject to the laws and regulations of the State of California, including but not limited to the California Labor Code ("Cal. Labor Code" or "Labor Code") and

applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

- 5. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and has therefore sued them by the above names which are fictitious. Plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting true names in lieu of the fictitious names, together with apt and proper charging words, when the true names are ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that each of the Defendants designated in this Complaint as DOES are responsible and liable to Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class in some manner for the events, happenings, and contentions referred to in this complaint. All references in this complaint to "Defendants" shall be deemed to include Defendants NFI and all DOE Defendants collectively.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each Defendant, including DOES, was and is the agent, employee, servant, subsidiary, partner, member, associate, or representative of each other Defendant, including DOES, and all of the things alleged to have been done by the Defendants, and each of them, were done in the course and scope of the agency, employment, service, or representative relationship and with the knowledge and consent of their respective principals, employers, masters, parent corporations, partners, members, associates, or representatives.
- 7. Some or all of the unlawful practices and tortious conduct complained of herein occurred in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- 8. While Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class Members were employed as non-exempt Employees, Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class routinely worked periods of four (4) hours or more, twice per workday, without receiving two (2) full, uninterrupted, ten (10) minute rest break per every four (4) hours worked, in violation of the California Industrial Commission's Order 1-2001.
- 9. Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class, All Non-Exempt Employees, a full uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period for every five hours worked and never sought a written waiver from the employees prior to depriving them of the meal

breaks due under the law, in violation of the California Industrial Welfare Commission's Orders 1-2001.

- 10. Defendant delivers supply chain solutions to its customers by providing distribution, transportation, global logistics and real estate expertise to the commercial, retail, and private sectors. Defendants are subject to California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders 1-2001, which are applicable to Manufacturing Industry, 8 Cal. Code Reg. §11010.
- 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that during the last four (4) years, not fewer than 100 individual non-exempt Employees and laborers (hereinafter referred to as "All Non-Exempt Employees" or "Plaintiff Class") were employed by Defendants as Non-Exempt Employees including, but not limited to, all non-exempt employees at NFI factories and warehouses.
- 12. All Non-Exempt Employees at NFI were hired to work exclusively for eight (8) hours or more, counting, sorting, torching and refurbishing returns, while not being compensated for all overtime hours worked or being permitted to take their full uninterrupted meal and rest breaks.
- 13. If an order or shipment were to come into Defendants' factories or warehouses, then All Non-Exempt Employees, including Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class Members, were required to work through rest and meal breaks, and were not permitted to leave the workplace, even when their shifts had finished, until the full amount of work related duty was completed.
- 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that throughout the period covered by this action, the Defendants designed and implemented a scheme that required the All Non-Exempt Employees, including Plaintiff, to work long hours to complete special projects and orders, whereby the All Non-Exempt Employees, including Plaintiff, were discouraged from taking, and denied, meal and rest period breaks when the warehouses and factories were extremely busy and had to process large orders for major clients.
- 15. Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class Members are further informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that throughout the period covered by this action, they often worked before

and after their scheduled shifts in order to complete large work orders or shipments, or to prepare for or complete their daily work requirements by having meetings. Moreover, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class Members allege that the hours they were required to work after their scheduled shifts ended, in order to finish large work orders for major clients, were not accurately accounted for or compensated. Plaintiff Cuevas alleges that Defendant required employees to engage in a morning "huddle" whereas Defendant would instruct them on work-related duties. This potential off-the-clock meeting resulted in Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class Members being uncompensated for their work-related duties.

- 16. Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class Members are further informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that the time they worked before and after their scheduled shifts, in order to finish large work orders for major clients were not accurately reported on their wage statements. This caused Plaintiff to be unable to properly account for the true and accurate compensation owed for work performed by Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class for Defendants.
- 17. Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class Members bring this action on behalf of themselves, and on behalf of other current and former Non-Exempt Employees employed by Defendants and pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq., on behalf of other members of the general public.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

REST PERIODS

18. While employed as Non-Exempt Employees, Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class routinely worked periods of four (4) hours or more, twice per workday, without receiving a rest break. The California Industrial Welfare Commission Order 1-2001 provides, in pertinent part, that:

"Every employer shall authorize and permit employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof.

- 19. Defendants' practice of requiring employees to work for four (4) hours and more without a rest period is in violation of the Industrial Welfare Commission's Wage Orders, the California Labor Code and relevant laws, rules, orders, requirements and regulations of the State of California.
- 20. Defendants required and permitted its employees to work without the rest periods provided by California Labor Law for more than four (4) years. Plaintiff Cuevas alleges rest breaks were not provided because they were always interrupted by managers. Oftentimes, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class worked twelve-hour work shifts and was not provided all of their breaks by the end of their shifts. For example, no third rest break was ever given during a twelve hour day. Plaintiff and the putative class are entitled to back wages to compensate them retroactively for all break periods of which they were deprived during the class period, plus all applicable penalties, in addition to one hour's compensation as prescribed by the applicable Wage Orders.

MEAL PERIODS

- 21. California Wage Order 1-2001, at Paragraph 11, provides as follows:

 "(A) No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day's work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employees.
- 22. Defendants did not provide its Non-Exempt Employees, including Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class Members, a thirty (30) minute meal period for every five (5) hours worked and never sought a written waiver from the employees prior to depriving them of their meal breaks due under the various laws. Plaintiff Cuevas alleges that at least six (6) times he was only allowed to have his meal period after the fifth hour of work; and due to the commonality of the class and workload, this treatment was shared by Plaintiff Class Members. Plaintiff Cuevas also alleges that it was common and customary for him to work ten (10) hours or more, and was only provided a second meal period 20% of the time. Otherwise, a second meal

23. Defendants suffered and permitted its employees to work without the meal periods prescribed by California Labor Law for more than four (4) years. Plaintiff and the putative class are entitled to back wages to compensate them retroactively for all meal periods of which they were deprived during the class period, plus all applicable penalties, in addition to one hour's compensation.

FAILURE TO PAY WAGES OWED

- 24. While employed as Non-Exempt Employees, Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class routinely worked periods of time before and after their scheduled workdays.
- 25. California Labor Code §204 provides that all wages, other than those mentioned in 201, 201.3, 202, 204.1, and 204.2, earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays.
- 26. Furthermore, Industrial Welfare Commission Order 1-2001 provides, in pertinent part, that:

"Every employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period...

- 27. While employed as All Non-Exempt Employees, Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class were caused to not receive their full pay for all work compensated, due to the acts and omissions of Defendants. These acts and omissions in turn caused Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class to not receive an amount equal to minimum wage for all hours worked, in accordance with Industrial Welfare Commission Order 1-2001.
- 28. Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class are entitled to back pay for all of their unpaid wages.

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE WAGE STATEMENTS

- 29. While employed as Non-Exempt Employees, Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class routinely worked periods of time before and after their scheduled workdays, which were not accurately accounted for on their wage statements.
- 30. Under California Labor Code §226 and Industrial Wage Order 1-2001,
 Defendants were obligated to keep an accurate record of the hours of labor worked by
 Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class and to prepare and submit to Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class with
 each payment of wages an itemized statement accurately showing the total hours worked by
 Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class.
- 31. Defendants, and each of them, failed to keep precise records of Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class's hours worked, and further failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements with each payment of wages to Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class as required by law. Instead, Defendants issued untimely, false, incorrect, fraudulent, and/or no wage statements to certain employees, including without limitation, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class.
- 32. Pursuant to Labor Code §226, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class is entitled to a penalty of \$50.00 for the first violation and \$100.00 per pay period for each subsequent violation of this section, according to proof, up to a maximum amount of \$4,000.00.

SUITABILITY OF CLASS

- 33. The First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Causes of Action in this Complaint are being brought, and may properly be maintained, as a class action pursuant to the provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure §382 and other applicable law, because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the proposed class is ascertainable.
- 34. The proposed class that Plaintiff seeks to represent for the class action causes of action (previously and hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff Class" or "Class Members" or "All Non-Exempt Employees") is composed of:
- 35. Any and all current and former NFI Non-Exempt Employees who worked for NFI's distribution, transportation, logistics and/or real estate locations. This list is not

exhaustive and includes, but is not limited to: drivers, loaders, supply chain experts, real estate personnel, handlers, forklift operators and/or any employee hired to facilitate any facet of NFI's multi-operational goals. This list includes any employees who were employed at NFI at any time beginning four (4) years preceding the filing of the Complaint in this action through final judgment in this action.

- 36. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the class is ascertainable:
 - a. NUMEROSITY: The Plaintiff Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all members is impractical under the circumstances of this case. While the exact number persons in Plaintiff Class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believe, and thereon allege, that over 100 current and former Non-Exempt Employees have been employed by Defendants at NFI during the period commencing four (4) years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this action, to date.
 - b. COMMON QUESTIONS PREDOMINATE: Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Plaintiff Class and predominate over any questions that affect only individual members of the class. The predominant common questions of law and fact include:
 - i. Whether Defendants provided Plaintiff and/or Plaintiff Class with proper Rest and Meal Periods;
 - ii. Whether Defendants provided Plaintiff and/or Plaintiff Class with accurate earnings statements and documentation of their hours worked.
 - iii. Whether Defendants provided Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class with all wages earned when due.
 - c. TYPICALITY: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Plaintiff Class.

 Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class sustained damages arising out of Defendants'

 common practice of failing to provide meal and rest breaks, proper wage

 statements, and proper compensation.

- d. ADEQUACY: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the class. Plaintiff's attorneys have experience in employment and class action matters and may adequately represent the class in this matter.

 Plaintiff has no interest that is adverse to the interests of those in the Plaintiff Class.
 - e. SUPERIORITY: A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Because individual joinder of all members of the class is impractical, class action treatment will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently and without the unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would engender. The relatively minor amount of individual damages in question coupled with the expenses and burdens of individual litigation would make it difficult or impossible for individual members of the class to redress the wrongs done to them, while important public interests will be served by addressing the matter as a class action. The cost to, and burden on, the court system of adjudication of individualized litigation would be substantial and substantially more than the costs and burdens of a class action. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES [Cal. Labor Code §510(a)]
(Against All Defendants)

- 37. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in each and every aforementioned paragraph, as though fully set forth herein.
 - 38. Under California Labor Code §510(a):

 "Eight hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of

- work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee."
- 39. During Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class's employment with Defendants on several occasions, Defendants required that Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class work, and Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class actually worked, in excess of eight (8) hours in one (1) workday and in excess of forty (40) hours in one (1) workweek. On such occasions, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class at least one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for overtime hours worked.
- 40. Defendants, to this date, have not paid Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class for the overtime hours they worked.
- 41. As a proximate result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class overtime, pursuant to the provisions of California Labor Code §510(a), Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class have suffered losses in earnings, and other employment benefits along with other incidental and consequential damages and losses, all in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 42. As a proximate result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class overtime, pursuant to the provisions of California Labor Code §510(a), Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class have suffered and will continue to suffer economic damages in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 43. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 218.5, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class requests that the court award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in this action.
- 44. Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class also seeks damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(f) and California Labor Code § 558.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO ALLOW MEAL BREAKS [Cal. Labor Code §226.7]

(Against All Defendants)

- 45. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate by reference each and every allegation contained in each and every aforementioned paragraph as though fully set forth herein.
 - 46. California Labor Code § 226.7 requires an employer to pay an additional hour

of compensation for each required meal period the employer fails to provide. Employees are entitled to a meal period of at least thirty (30) minutes per five (5) hour work period.

- 47. Plaintiff consistently worked over five (5) hour shifts. Pursuant to the Labor Code and Wage Order 1-2001, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class were entitled to an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to exceeding five (5) hours of employment.
- 48. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class with either timely uninterrupted meal breaks of not less than thirty (30) minutes or to provide Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class with an additional hour of compensation for each meal period missed as required during the time that Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class were employed with Defendants.
- 49. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class are entitled to damages of one (1) hour of wages per missed meal break, in a sum to be proven at trial.
- 50. Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class also seeks damages pursuant to California Labor Code §2699(f) and California Labor Code §558.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO ALLOW REST BREAKS [Cal. Labor Code §226.7]
(Against All Defendants)

- 51. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in each and every aforementioned paragraph as though fully set forth herein.
- 52. California Labor Code §226.7 requires an employer to pay an additional hour of compensation for each workday where an employee fails to receive a rest period for each consecutive four (4) hour shift worked. Employees are entitled to an uninterrupted net rest period of at least ten (10) minutes per each consecutive four (4) hour work period or major fraction thereof, after the first three and one-half (3½) hours worked in a workday.
- 53. Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class consistently worked four (4) hour shifts. Pursuant to the California Labor Code and Wage Order 1-2001, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class are entitled to an uninterrupted rest period of not less than ten (10) minutes for each consecutive four (4)

hour shift worked or major fraction thereof.

- 54. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class with either timely uninterrupted rest breaks of not less than ten (10) minutes or to provide Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class with an additional hour of compensation for each rest period missed as required during the time that Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class were employed with Defendants.
- 55. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class are entitled to damages of one (1) hour of wages per missed rest break, in a sum to be proven at trial.
- 56. Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class also seeks damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699 and California Labor Code § 558.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WAITING TIME PENALTIES [Cal. Labor Code §§201-203]
(Against All Defendants)

- 57. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in each and every aforementioned paragraph as though fully set forth herein.
- 58. Defendants' failure to pay wages, as alleged above, was willful in that Defendants, and each of them, knew wages to be due but failed to pay them, thus entitling Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class to penalties under California Labor Code §203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue as penalty until paid in full, for a period of up to thirty (30) days from the time they were due.
- 59. Plaintiff believes, and based thereon allege, that Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class in a sum certain at the time of termination and have failed to pay these sums for thirty (30) days thereafter. Pursuant to the provisions of California Labor Code §203, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class are entitled to penalties in the amount of Plaintiff' and Plaintiff Class' daily wages, multiplied by thirty(30) days.

| 26 | /// |
|----|------------|
| 27 | /// /// |
| 28 | /// |

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL HOURS WORKED WHEN DUE [Cal. Labor Code §204]

(Against All Defendants)

- 60. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in each and every aforementioned paragraph as though fully set forth herein.
- 61. Section 204 of the California Labor Code states that all wages, other than those mentioned in 201, 201.3, 202, 204.1, or 204.2, earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays.
- 62. As described hereinabove, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class all wages owed for all hours worked, per pay period, in a timely manner.
- 63. Defendants therefore owe damages to Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class in the amount of any remaining unpaid wages, in addition to penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §210, in the amount of \$100.00 for each failure to pay Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE WAGE STATEMENTS [Cal. Labor Code §226]

(Against All Defendants)

- 64. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in each and every aforementioned paragraph as though fully set forth herein.
- 65. Defendants, and each of them, were obligated under Labor Code §226 and the applicable Industrial Wage Orders, to keep an accurate record of the hours of labor worked by Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class and to prepare and submit to Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class, with each payment of wages, an itemized statement accurately showing the total hours worked by Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class.
- 66. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class is entitled to a penalty of \$50.00 for the first violation and \$100.00 per pay period for each subsequent violation of this section, according to proof, up to a maximum amount of \$4,000.00.
 - 67. In this instance, Defendants, and each of them, either prepared and submitted to

Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class inaccurate wage statements or did not prepare and submit any wage statements to Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class during the relevant statutory period and during the entire term of Plaintiff' and Plaintiff Class' employment with Defendants.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES [Business & Professions Code §17200]

(Against All Defendants)

- 68. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate by reference each and every allegation contained in each and every aforementioned paragraph as though fully set forth herein.
- 69. California Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq. prohibits unlawful and unfair business practices. Plaintiff is "persons" within the meaning of California Business & Professions Code (hereinafter "B&P Code") § 17204, and has standing to bring this cause of action for injunctive relief, restitution, and other appropriate equitable relief.
- 70. Wage and hour laws express fundamental public policies. California Labor Code §90.5(a) and §98.6 articulate the public policies of this State to enforce vigorously minimum labor standards, to ensure that employees are not required or permitted to work under substandard and unlawful conditions, to ensure employees are not retaliated against for complaining of violations under the Labor Code, and to protect law-abiding employers and their employees from competitors who lower their costs by failing to comply with minimum labor standards.
- 71. Defendants have violated statutes and public policies, as alleged throughout this Complaint. Through the conduct alleged in this Complaint, Defendants have acted contrary to these public policies, have violated specific provisions of the California Labor Code, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair business practices in violation of B&P Code § 17200, et seq., depriving Plaintiff of the rights, benefits, and privileges guaranteed to all employees under the law.
- 72. Moreover, by not properly compensating Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class, and improperly gaining extra labor by failing to provide rest and meal periods to Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class, Defendants have gained an unfair business advantage over other California

companies that follow the letter of the law and do not make such ill-gotten gains, in further violation of B&P Code § 17200.

- 73. Defendants, by violating wage and hour laws as described above under the California Labor Code, either knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known that their conduct was unlawful. Therefore, Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes unfair competition and unfair business practices in violation of B&P Code § 17200, et seq.
- 74. As a proximate result of the above-mentioned acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class have been damaged in a sum to be proven at trial.
- 75. Unless restrained by this Honorable Court, Defendants will continue to engage in the unlawful conduct as alleged herein. Pursuant to the B&P Code, this Court should make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment, by Defendants, their agents or employees, of any unlawful or deceptive practice prohibited by the B&P Code and/or, including but not limited to, disgorgement of profits which may be necessary to restore Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class with the money Defendants have unlawfully failed to pay.
- 76. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class request relief as hereinafter provided.

///

28 | ///

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Plaintiff Class pray for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

- 1. For compensatory, consequential and incidental damages (including past and future lost wages, bonuses, expenses and other losses) in an amount to be proven at trial;
- 2. For special damages, according to proof;
- 3. For prejudgment interest;
- 4. For attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.5, 1194, and 2699, Code of Civil Procedure § 1 021.5, and all other provisions of law authorizing an award of attorney's fees;
- 5. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 6. For waiting time penalties pursuant to California Labor Code§ 203;
- 7. For punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial (Civil Code §3294);
- 8. For the costs of suit herein incurred;
- 9. For interest on the amount of compensation due, according to proof; and
- 10. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem proper.

DATED: March 22, 2018

Respectfully Submitted,

SOLOUKI & SAVOY, LLP

Grant Joseph Savoy, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff GASPAR CUEVAS and CLASS MEMBERS.

28

SOLOUKI | SAVOY, LLP

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demand trial by jury on all issues so triable in the Complaint.

DATED: March 22, 2018

Respectfully Submitted,

SOLOUKI & SAVOY, LLP

Grant-Joseph-Savoy, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff GASPAR CUEVAS and CLASS MEMBERS.

| | | | COPY |
|----|--|--|---|
| SU | TTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Barn Grant Joseph Savoy, Esq. (SBN 284077) SOLOUKI SAVOY, LLP 316 W. 2nd Street, Suite 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90012 TELEPHONE NO.: (213)814-4940 ITORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff - Gaspar Cue PERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, CA 900 BRANCH NAME: Stanley Mosk, Central CASE NAME: Gaspar Cuevas v. NFI Interactive Los CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET | FAX NO.: (213)814-2550 vas s Angeles 12 I District | CM-010 FOR COURT USE ONLY CONFORMED COPY OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Court MAR 22 2018 Sherri R. Carter, Executive Unicer/Clerk By Shaunya Bolden, Deputy CASE NUMBER: |
| | (Amount (Amount demanded is exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less) | Counter Joinder Filed with first appearance by defendan (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402) | JUDGE: BC 6 9 8 8 3 1 |
| | Items 1–6 belo | w must be completed (see instructions on | page 2). |
| | Check one box below for the case type that Auto Tort Auto (22) Uninsured motorist (46) Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort Asbestos (04) Product liability (24) Medical malpractice (45) Other PI/PD/WD (23) Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort Business tort/unfair business practice (07) Civil rights (08) Defamation (13) Fraud (16) Intellectual property (19) Professional negligence (25) Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35) Employment Wrongful termination (36) Vother employment (15) | Contract Breach of contract/warranty (06) Rule 3.740 collections (09) Other collections (09) Insurance coverage (18) Other contract (37) Real Property Eminent domain/inverse condemnation (14) Wrongful eviction (33) Other real property (26) Unlawful Detainer Commercial (31) Residential (32) Drugs (38) | Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) Construction defect (10) Mass tort (40) Securities litigation (28) Environmental/Toxic tort (30) Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41) forcement of Judgment Enforcement of judgment (20) scellaneous Civil Complaint RICO (27) Other complaint (not special (42)) scellaneous Civil Petition Partnership and corporate governance (21) Other petition (not specified above) (43) |
| 2. | This case is is not comp factors requiring exceptional judicial managa. Large number of separately represb. Extensive motion practice raising dissues that will be time-consuming c. Substantial amount of documentary | lex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules lement: sented parties d. Large number of difficult or novel e. Coordination with to resolve in other counties by evidence f. Substantial postj | h related actions pending in one or more courts, states, or countries, or in a federal court adapted judicial supervision |
| 4. | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | laratory or injunctive relief c. punitive |

5. This case [] is not a class action suit.
6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form) CM-015.)

Date: March 22, 2018 Grant Joseph Savoy, Esq.

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

NOTICE

 Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result in sanctions.

• File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.

 If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding.

Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.

SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ACTORNEY FOR PARTY)

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2,30 and 3,220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the *Civil Case Cover Sheet* to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

```
Auto Tort
      Auto (22)-Personal Injury/Property
          Damage/Wrongful Death
     Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the
          case involves an uninsured
          motorist claim subject to
          arbitration, check this item instead of Auto)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/
Property Damage/Wrongful Death)
     Asbestos (04)
         Asbestos Property Damage
          Asbestos Personal Injury/
               Wrongful Death
     Product Liability (not asbestos or
     toxic/environmental) (24)
Medical Malpractice (45)
          Medical Malpractice-
               Physicians & Surgeons
          Other Professional Health Care
               Malpractice
     Other PI/PD/WD (23)
          Premises Llability (e.g., slip
               and fall)
         Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD
               (e.g., assault, vandalism)
         Intentional Infliction of
               Emotional Distress
         Negligent Infliction of
               Emotional Distress
         Other PI/PD/WD
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort
     Business Tort/Unfair Business
        Practice (07)
     Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) (not civil
         harassment) (08)
     Defamation (e.g., slander, libel)
     (13)
Fraud (16)
     Intellectual Property (19)
Professional Negligence (25)
         Legal Malpractice
         Other Professional Malpractice
     (not medical or legal)
Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)
Employment
```

```
CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES
Contract
     Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)
         Breach of Rental/Lease
              Contract (not unlawful detainer
         or wrongful eviction)
Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller
             Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence)
         Negligent Breach of Contract/
             Warranty
         Other Breach of Contract/Warranty
    Collections (e.g., money owed, open
         book accounts) (09)
         Collection Case-Seller Plaintiff
         Other Promissory Note/Collections
             Case
    Insurance Coverage (not provisionally
         complex) (18)
         Auto Subrogation
         Other Coverage
    Other Contract (37)
         Contractual Fraud
         Other Contract Dispute
Real Property
    Eminent Domain/Inverse
         Condemnation (14)
    Wrongful Eviction (33)
    Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)
         Writ of Possession of Real Property
         Mortgage Foreclosure
         Quiet Title
         Other Real Property (not eminent
         domain, landlord/tenant, or
         foreclosure)
Unlawful Detainer
    Commercial (31)
    Residential (32)
    Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal
         drugs, check this item; otherwise,
         report as Commercial or Residential)
Judicial Review
    Asset Forfelture (05)
Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)
    Writ of Mandate (02)
Writ-Administrative Mandamus
Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court
            Case Matter
         Writ-Other Limited Court Case
            Review
    Other Judicial Review (39)
Review of Health Officer Order
        Notice of Appeal-Labor
```

```
Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal.
Rules of Court Rules 3,400-3,403)
      Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)
      Construction Defect (10)
     Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)
Securities Litigation (28)
Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)
Insurance Coverage Claims
          (arising from provisionally complex
          case type listed above) (41)
 Enforcement of Judgment
      Enforcement of Judgment (20)
          Abstract of Judgment (Out of
               County)
          Confession of Judgment (non-
               domestic relations)
          Sister State Judgment
          Administrative Agency Award
             (not unpaid taxes)
          Petition/Certification of Entry of
             Judgment on Unpaid Taxes
          Other Enforcement of Judgment Case
 Miscellaneous Givil Complaint
     RICO (27)
      Other Complaint (not specified
          above) (42)
          Declaratory Relief Only Injunctive Relief Only (non-
              harassment)
          Mechanics Lien
          Other Commercial Complaint
               Case (non-tort/non-complex)
          Other Civil Complaint
              (non-tort/non-complex)
 Miscellaneous Civil Petition
     Partnership and Corporate
          Governance (21)
     Other Petition (not specified
          above) (43)
Civil Harassment
          Workplace Violence
          Elder/Dependent Adult
              Abuse
          Election Contest
          Petition for Name Change
          Petition for Relief From Late
              Claim
          Other Civil Petition
```

CM-010

Wrongful Termination (36)

Other Employment (15)

SHORT TITLE: Gaspar Cuevas v. NFI Interactive Logistics, LLC, et al

CASE NUMBER

BC 6 9 8 8 3

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.3 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.

- **Step 1:** After completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet (Judicial Council form CM-010), find the exact case type in Column A that corresponds to the case type indicated in the Civil Case Cover Sheet.
- Step 2: In Column B, check the box for the type of action that best describes the nature of the case.
- **Step 3:** In Column C, circle the number which explains the reason for the court filing location you have chosen.

Applicable Reasons for Choosing Court Filing Location (Column C)

- 1. Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Central District.
- 2. Permissive filing in central district.
- 3. Location where cause of action arose.
- 4. Mandatory personal injury filing in North District.
- 5. Location where performance required or defendant resides.
- 6. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.

- 7. Location where petitioner resides.
- 8. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
- 9. Location where one or more of the parties reside.
- 10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office.
- 11. Mandatory filing location (Hub Cases unlawful detainer, limited non-collection, limited collection, or personal injury).

| | , | |
|--|--|--|
| A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No. | B Type of Action (Check only one) | Applicable Reasons See Step 3 Above |
| Auto (22) | ☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death | 1, 4, 11 |
| Uninsured Motorist (46) | ☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist | 1, 4, 11 ⁻² · |
| Asbestos (04) | ☐ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage ☐ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death | 1, 11 1, 11 |
| Product Liability (24) | ☐ A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) | 1, 4, 11 |
| Medical Malpractice (45) | ☐ A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons ☐ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice | 1, 4, 11 1, 4, 11 |
| Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23) | □ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) □ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) □ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress □ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death | 1, 4, 11 1, 4, 11 1, 4, 11 1, 4, 11 |

Auto Tort

Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort

LACIV 109 (Rev 2/16) LASC Approved 03-04 SHORT TITLE: Gaspar Cuevas v. NFI Interactive Logistics, LLC, et al

| | A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No. | | | B Type of Action (Check only one) | C Applicable Reasons - See Step:3 Above |
|--|---|-------------|----------------|---|---|
| | Business Tort (07) | | A6029 | Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract) | 1, 2, 3 |
| perfy 1 Tort | Civil Rights (08) | | A6005 | Civil Rights/Discrimination | 1, 2, 3 |
| y/ Pro I Death | Defamation (13) | П | A6010 | Defamation (slander/libel) | 1, 2, 3 |
| al Injur ongful | Fraud (16) | П | A6013 | Fraud (no contract) | 1, 2, 3 |
| Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort | Professional Negligence (25) | _ _ | | Legal Malpractice Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal) | 1, 2, 3 1, 2, 3 |
| žö | Other (35) | | A6025 | Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort | 1, 2, 3 |
| ent | Wrongful Termination (36) | П | A6037 | Wrongful Termination | 1, 2, 3 |
| Employment | Other Employment (15) | • | | Other Employment Complaint Case Labor Commissioner Appeals | 1, 2, 3 10 |
| Contract | Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance) | 0 0 | A6008 A6019 | Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence) | 2, 5 2, 5 1, 2, 5 1, 2, 5 |
| | Collections (09) | _ _ _ | A6012 | Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff Other Promissory Note/Collections Case Collections Case-Purchased Debt (Charged Off Consumer Debt Purchased on or after January 1, 2014) | 5, 6, 11 5, 11 5, 6, 11 |
| | Insurance Coverage (18) | | A6015 | Insurance Coverage (not complex) | 1, 2, 5, 8 |
| | Other Contract (37) | | A6031 | Contractual Fraud Tortious Interference Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence) | 1, 2, 3, 5 1, 2, 3, 5 1, 2, 3, 8, 9 |
| | Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14) | | A7300 | Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels | 2,6 |
| operty | Wrongful Eviction (33) | | A6023 | Wrongful Eviction Case | 2, 6 |
| Real Property | Other Real Property (26) | | A6032 | Mortgage Foreclosure Quiet Title Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/lenant, foreclosure) | 2, 6 2, 6 2, 6 |
| <u>.</u> | Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31) | | A6021 | Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction) | 6, 11 |
| Unlawful Detainer | Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32) | П | A6020 | Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction) | 6, 11 |
| wful [| Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34) | | A6020F | Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure | 2, 6, 11 |
| Unla | Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38) | | A6022 | Unlawful Detainer-Drugs | 2, 6, 11 |

SHORT TITLE:
Gaspar Cuevas v. NFI Interactive Logistics, LLC, et al

| A IVII Case Cover Sheet Category No | | Type of Action (Check only one) | C Applicable Reasons: See Step 3 Above |
|--|---|---|--|
| Asset Forfelture (05) | □ A6108 | 3 Asset Forfeiture Case | 2, 3, 6 |
| lition re Arbitration (11) | □ A6115 | Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration | 2, 5 |
| Vrit of Mandate (02) | □ A6152 | Writ - Administrative Mandamus Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review | 2, 8 2 2 |
| er Judicial Review (39) | □ A6150 | Other Writ /Judicial Review | 2, 8 |
| ust/Trade Regulation (03) | □ A6003 | Antitrust/Trade Regulation | 1, 2, 8 |
| nstruction Defect (10) | □ A6007 | Construction Defect . | 1, 2, 3 |
| ms Involving Mass Tort (40) | □ A6006 | Claims Involving Mass Tort | 1, 2, 8 |
| curities Liligation (28) | □ A6035 | Securities Litigation Case | 1, 2, 8 |
| Toxic Tort Environmental (30) | П A6036 | Toxic Tort/Environmental | 1, 2, 3, 8 |
| ance Coverage Claims n Complex Case (41) | □ A6014 | Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only) | 1, 2, 5, 8 |
| Enforcement of Judgment (20) | □ A6160 □ A6107 □ A6140 □ A6114 | Sister State Judgment Abstract of Judgment Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax Other Enforcement of Judgment Case | 2, 5, 11 2, 6 2, 9 2, 8 2, 8 2, 8 |
| RJCO (27) | □ A6033 | Racketeering (RICO) Case | 1, 2, 8 |
| Other Complaints Specified Above) (42) | □ A6040 □ A6011 | Declaratory Relief Only Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex) | 1, 2, 8 2, 8 1, 2, 8 1, 2, 8 |
| rtnership Corporation Governance (21) | □ A6113 | Partnership and Corporate Governance Case | 2,8 |
| Other Petitions (Not pecified Above) (43) | ☐ A6123 ☐ A6124 ☐ A6190 ☐ A6110 ☐ A6170 | Election Contest Petition for Change of Name/Change of Gender Petition for Rellef from Late Claim Law | 2, 3, 9 2, 3, 9 2, 3, 9 2 2, 7 2, 3, 8 2, 9 |
| | Above) (43) | titions (Not Above) (43) ☐ A6190 ☐ A6110 ☐ A6170 | litions (Not Above) (43) ☐ A6190 Election Contest ☐ A6110 Pelition for Change of Name/Change of Gender |

| | SHORT TITLE: Gaspar Cuevas v. NFI Interactive Logistics, LLC, et al | CASE NUMBER |
|---|---|-------------|
| ı | | |

Step 4: Statement of Reason and Address: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected. Enter the address which is the basis for the filing location, including zip code. (No address required for class action cases).

| | | 10. 🗆 11. | ADDRESS: 11811 E Florence Ave Santa Fe Springs, California 90675 |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|--|
| Los Angeles | STATE: CA | ZIP CODE: 90040 | |

| Dated: | March 22, 2018 | |
|--------|----------------|--|
| | | |

(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 02/16).
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless there is court order for waiver, partial or scheduled payments.
- 6. A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
- 7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.

Case 2:18-cv-03320-JGB-SP Document 1-1 Filed 04/20/18 Page 27 of 27 Page ID #:39

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES NOTICE OF CASE ASSIGNMENT - UNLIMITED CIVIL - COMPLEX

| Case Number _ | • | BC 6 | 98 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
|---------------|-------|------|----|---|---|---|
| | | | | • | • | |

THIS FORM IS TO BE SERVED WITH THE SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT

Your case is assigned for all purposes to the judicial officer indicated below.

| | ASSIGNED JUDGE | DEPT | ROOM | ASSIGNED JUDGE DE | PT ROOM |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|--------|---|-------------------------|
| | Hon. Elihu M. Berle | 323 | 1707 | | |
| | Hon. William F. Highberger | 322 | 1702 - | | |
| | Hon. John Shepard Wiley, Jr. | 311 | 1408 | 72 | |
| | Hon. Kenneth Freeman | 310 | 1412 | · | |
| | Hon. Ann Jones | (308) | 1415 | | |
| | Hon. Maren E. Nelson | 307 | 1402 | | |
| | Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl | 309 | 1409 | | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | , | | | |
| | | | | Carrie Company | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | e | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | · | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | Hon. Steven J. Kleifield 3 | 24 CCW |
| | ·. | | | *Provisional complex (non-class action) case assignment pending complex determination | 09 Supervisin Judge CCW |

| Given to the Plaintiff/Cross-Complainant/ | Attorney of Record on | · | |
|---|-----------------------|--------|--|
| • | | (Date) | |
| SHERRI R. CARTER, Executive Officer | /Clerk of Court | | |
| Ву | , Deputy Clerk | | |

